

REMARKS

Claims 15-17, 19-21, and 23-24 remain in this application. Claims 1-14 were previously canceled, and claims 25-34, directed to the non-elected invention, are canceled above. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 19 and 23 are amended above following consideration of the comments provided by the Examiner in sections 5-6 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. All claims in this application should now comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Independent claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), along with all claims depending thereon, as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,095,659 to Benoit et al. Reconsideration is requested.

As amended above, claim 15 requires the assembly support forming the subject matter of this application to include a lock unit fastened thereto, an outside actuating unit of the locking system for arrangement on an inner side of an outer body shell skin and coupled by an operative connection to the lock unit, and an adaptor fastening the outside actuating unit and the lock unit together. These limitations are not met or suggested by the Benoit et al. patent disclosure.

It is unclear from the rejection as presented what element or elements of the Benoit et al. assemblies the Examiner considers to be the “outside actuating unit” recited in claim 15. In any event, the Benoit et al. handle plate 81, identified on page 3 of the Office Action as an “operative connection,” does not couple any such outside actuating unit, which is to be arranged on an inner side of an outer body shell skin, to the Benoit et al. latch mechanism 57 (identified as the “lock unit” by the Examiner) as claim 15 specifies. Moreover, the handle

carrier 77, identified on page 4 by the Examiner as a second “adaptor,” does not serve to fasten any “outside actuating unit” and the latch mechanism 57 together as claim 15 defines.

It is respectfully submitted that the anticipation rejection presented in the last Office Action is inapplicable to claim 15 as it appears above for reasons discussed. Nothing identified would have suggested modifying any of the Benoit et al. assemblies so as to meet the limitations in claim 15 noted, moreover, and claim 15 above should be patentable. All other claims remaining in this application are dependent claims and should be patentable as well.

This application is now considered to be in allowable condition. If there are any questions regarding this Reply or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an extension of time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #095309.55847US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 21, 2009

/Richard R. Diefendorf/
Richard R. Diefendorf
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:rd